DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 898 CG 011 372

AUTHOR Seward, Rudy R.
TITLE The Family Versus Industrialization and Urbanization: Occupational Roles as a Potential Link.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; North Texas State Univ., Denton.
PUB DATE Apr 76
GRANT GS-33863
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Sociological Society (St. Louis, Missouri, April 21-24, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Agricultural Occupations; Economic Factors; Employment Patterns; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Heads of Households; *Industrialization; Labor Force; *Occupations; Research Projects; *Social Change; *Socioeconomic Influences; Sociology; Urbanization

ABSTRACT

The growth and development of industrialization and urbanization has been cited widely as the key active agents in bringing about family change. Of the two processes, industrialization is considered more influential in changing the family and, also, it offers the best opportunity for empirical testing. In particular, the occupational role of the family head emerges as an important direct link between the family and the economy, and manifests most of the aspects attributed to industrialization. In an effort to test the significance of occupational roles performed by the family head, data were gathered for a sample of families from 9,600 households. The source of this data was original manuscript census schedules from 1850-1880. Data were gathered on various structural aspects of the family as well as on the occupation of its head. The resulting data suggest that as the proportion of farmers declined in the labor force some change in the structure of the family took place; however, the expected relationship between occupational group for non-farm jobs and family structure often followed a pattern in reverse of expectations. (Author/JLL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138898

THE FAMILY VERSUS INDUSTRIALIZATION AND URBANIZATION: OCCUPATIONAL ROLES AS A POTENTIAL LINK*

By

Rudy Ray Seward

Department of Sociology

North Texas State University

Denton, Texas 76203

*Revision of a paper read at the annual meeting of The Midwest Sociological Society, April 1976. The collection of the data utilized in this study was supported in part by a Doctoral Dissertation Grant (GS-33863) from the National Science Foundation. The Analysis of the data and further research was supported in part by a Faculty Research Grant (73-34934) from North Texas State University.

CG 011372

Abstract

The growth and development of industrialization and urbanization has been cited widely as the key active agents in bringing about family change. Despite this emphasis most works do not attempt to provide the specific aspects of these two processes which have supposedly initiated family adaptation. An attempt is made to compile and discuss various aspects and their importance which have and can be attributed to these two processes in their relationship to the family. Of the two processes industrialization is considered more influential in changing the family and also it offers the best opportunity for empirical testing. In particular the family head's occupational role emerges as an important and direct link between the family and the economy which manifest most of the aspects attributed to industrialization. In an effort to test the significance of occupational roles performed by the family head, data were gathered for a sample of families from 9,600 households. The source of this data was original manuscript census schedules from the 1850 through to the 1880 censuses. Data were gathered on various structural aspects of the family as well as on the occupation of its head. The resulting data suggest that as the proportion of farmers declined in the labor force some change in the structure of the family took place; however, the expected relationship between occupational group for non-farm jobs and family structure often followed a pattern in reverse of expectations.

THE FAMILY VERSUS INDUSTRIALIZATION AND URBANIZATION: OCCUPATIONAL ROLES AS A POTENTIAL LINK

Much of the literature dealing with family change over the last century has cited the growth and development of the industrialization and urbanization processes as the active agents bringing about family adaptation. Despite this emphasis many of these works fail to provide the specifics of the relationship between the family and these two processes. Attention has primarily been directed at the manifestations of this relationship in the family--family structure has presumably adapted to these processes by changing from a predominatly large, influential, stable, extended unit to a small, mobile, independent, isolated unit. Although most works fail to provide specific aspects of industrialization and urbanization that have presumably effected the family, several scattered works present at least some aspects for one or both of these processes. This paper attempts to combine these works and present a list of what are considered the significant industrial and urban aspects which are important in understanding family change.

Of the two processes industrialization is usually emphasized more and offers the best opportunity for empirically testing the existence of a relationship. In particular the occupational role of the family head is considered an important and direct link between the family and the economy in which is manifest most of the various changes resulting from industrialization. An exploration of this link is carried out for a period -- the last half of the nineteenth century--of early and rapid industrialization in the United States.

Problem

The family as a social institution fulfills certain functions in society through the performance of some of its activities. The performance

of these activities by the familial institution affects other social institutions which, together with the family, make up the social system. The relationship goes both ways because the activities performed by other social institutions in turn have certain effects upon the family. These relationships can be conceived of as a series of interchanges (cf. Bell and Vogel, 1968:7-20; Parsons and Bales, 1955:90-15). A fit or stability is achieved between social institutions by the achievement of a balance in these interchanges; a balance is achieved when the contributions made by one social institution are reciprocated by contributions from other social institutions. This balance, which is not necessarily perfect, will be affected as the activities of a social institution change. As a result, the balance is usually in a state of flux and not stable. Finally, the interchanges are not necessarily in the form of concrete goods but may also be behavioral actions or responses.

The germane set of interchanges here are those occurring between the family and the economy. Today in urban-industrial societies the economic institution is that part of the social system concerned with the production and distribution of goods and services. At one time the production and distribution of goods and services was primarily a part of the activities performed by the family, but no longer. Most contemporary families in urban-industrial societies are now only concerned with the consumption of these goods and services. This transition of the family from essentially a self-sufficient economic unit to a unit of consumption is considered one of the important changes resulting from industrialization and urbanization. In addition to becoming a consumption unit the family has increasingly become dependent upon various agencies other than kin groupings to provide physical protection, education of the young, financial protection, etc.

This change is often presented in terms of the declining functions of the contemporary family in industrialized and urbanized societies. The transition of the family to a unit of consumption and its increasing dependency upon outside non-kin agencies is believed to have been concomitant with additional changes in other family patterns.

The contemporary family must acquire most of the necessary goods and services for its survival from the economy. In exchange for these goods and services, the family contributes to the economy resources which usually take the form of money. To obtain the necessary monetary resources in another interchange, the family provides labor for the economy. The laborer performs a certain work role or occupation in exchange for wages. This latter interchange--labor for the economy and wages for the family--is considered one of the most influential links between the familial institution and the economy.

This link is considered a very influential one between the economy and the family due to several conditions of the interchange. First, the same adults are carrying out roles in both institutions. For this reason Parsons (Parsons and Bales, 1955:12) refers to this interchange as "the basic mode of articulation" between the family and the economy. Second, usually only one adult family member has the primary responsibility for providing a source of income for the family. This results in other family members being dependent upon this adult. In turn this suggests that when new demands are placed upon the family member in the performance of his work role the dependent family members must accordingly make adjustments. Third, it is usually the adult male member of the family which is expected to meet this responsibility even when this may not be considered solely his task. This point seems even more appropriate when keeping in mind that this discussion is referring to the family unit throughout the development of industrialization and urbanization.

The fact that an adult male's successful participation in the occupational world is essential for high family status and the right to participate in family matters (cf. Aldous, 1969:708; Parsons and Bales, 1955:12) suggests the importance of compliance with this expectation. These conditions indicate the usefulness of studying the occupational status of the family head. An additional condition of this interchange is that more commitment is involved here than for other interchanges between the family and the economy (Bell and Vogel, 1968:13). For example in the exchange of its income for goods and services the family will do business with a variety of firms and will usually have no lasting commitment to any one firm. Conditions of the market such as the availability and cost of goods and services are the main determinants for which businesses the family selects. Labor services on the other hand are usually carried out in connection with only one firm and the terms of employment are often decided upon through direct contact between the family member and the firm.

Another index of the importance of this interchange has been the emphasis placed upon changes relating to occupations when discussing the industrialization of various nations. These changes are considered part of new characteristics and activities in the economy which result from the industrialization process. The changes have been cited by many (cf. Bell and Vogel, 1968:9-14; Goode, 1963:366-380; Martinson, 1970:75; Parsons and Bales, 1955:10-15) as having the power to reshape the family. The general contention has been that the small nuclear type of family is necessitated by (or at least complementary to) certain characteristics of industrialization (Greenfield, 1967:312).

One characteristic of an industrialized society assumed related to family structural changes is occupationally induced geographical mobility. In other words, for many individuals in an industrialized society to pursue, maintain, or improve their occupational position, they must be able to move geographically. Any kin group wider than the nuclear family would inhibit geographical mobility; therefore, the nuclear family becomes the unit of mobility. Furthermore, geographical mobility makes it difficult to keep in contact with kin which, in turn, further reduces the importance and frequency of kin relationships. The reproduction function is affected since larger families (more children) also inhibit geographical mobility. Contributing to fewer children as well is the fact that in an industrial society children tend to be economic liabilities and are no longer an asset.

Another characteristic of industrialization related to occupations is the creation of many new and different jobs--division of labor. As a result there is less intergenerational occupational stability and kin are generally more occupationally differentiated. Class-differential mobility (Goode, 1963:369) also contributes to this growing occupational differentiation. That is some family members are more upwardly mobile than others resulting in different standards of living and life styles. This reduces the ease and enjoyment of contact as well as the probability of any individual being able to help a kinsman in his job because, in most cases, they will be in a different occupation. Occupational mobility has been shown as "detrimental to extended family relations" (Stuckert, 1963:167). Stuckert found that socially mobile families (both upward and downward) tended to have less family cohesion than stable families. Mobile families tended to visit kin less, have lower levels of identification with kin, not use the kin as a reference group, and be less concerned with maintaining the extended family's unity.

Harris (1969:93-121) has pointed out two factors related to the creation of new and different jobs which are usually implicitly assumed in discussions of the relationship between industrialization and the family. The two factors are "degree of job differentiation and an increase in the level of skill" (p. 111). With the increase in job diversity that exists and with the higher degree of skill required, fewer workers can fill each other's job. What is happening, suggests Harris, is a reduction in the "substitutability" for many jobs as a nation industrializes. The lower the level of "substitutability" between jobs or the more fixed the occupations, the more difficult it becomes to "fit" individuals into jobs. In addition, the more difficult it is to fill jobs, the more necessary it will be to allot jobs purely on the basis of merit and the more moving around of workers and their families will be involved.

Alloting jobs on the basis of merit is considered part of changes in the value structure that accompanies industrialization. Although other value changes occur, of importance here is the increasing use of achievement rather than family membership as a basis for jobs placement. As a result the family no longer has one of its traditional rewards to use in exchange for obedience to family control.

As the industrialization process proceeds in a society, more differentiated jobs emerge that demand increasingly more specialized skill for their successful performance. In addition to this trend, it should be noted that in some segments of the economy, especially management, often attempts to reduce job differentiation and the level of specialized skill. This results from a fear that the more jobs are differentiated and the skill level increased, the more difficult it becomes to control the laborers holding these jobs. One alternative has been to increasingly automate various jobs which, in many cases, reduces the skill and differentiation of the affected occupations if they are not completely eliminated altogether.

On the other hand greater skills are often required by the "survivors." Hence not all occupational levels in society are going to be affected in the same manner. Some occupations show an increase in differentiation and skill (e. g. technicians) while others show a decrease in differentation and skill (c. g. certain types of operatives). The decrease in differentiation for the latter refers to the ability to perform many other jobs at the same level without any necessary increase in skill or training. Although a job may require a highly specific operation, such as a position on an assembly line, transfer to other positions similar in occupational level would be no more demanding.

The "effects" of industrialization should be greater for the more differentiated jobs which emerge that demand more specialized skill for their successful performance. As more individuals "fit" into these more differentiated occupations, demands are made upon the individual laborer which in turn affect his family. It follows that no matter what phase of industrialization a society is in, there should be variation between different occupational levels in terms of the degree of skill required and the extent of job differentiation. In addition, there should be differences in family patterns between occupational categories which might lead to a number of different family types (or different levels of incidence for family aspects), all associated with industrialization. Again occupation of the family head emerges an important variable. The effects of industrialization should be the greatest when the "substitutability" of the occupation of the head of the family is the lowest--the more fixed the occupation.

The urbanization process is more difficult to relate directly to the family. At the same time it is difficult to separate the urbanization process from industrialization. For example it was the process of urbanization that brought together the concentrated labor force necessary for industrial growth.

A combination of factors helped provide the necessary large and concentrated labor force: the increased mechanization of agriculture which met a reduction in labor force needs of farming, the disappearance of cheap land on the frontier, and the promise for greater economic security in urban areas "through higher wages and more attractive working conditions" (Lantz and Snyder, 1969:46-48). These factors worked together to shift a once dispersed rural population to one that became increasingly concentrated and congested.

The urban environment is thought to contain a number of elements that have had an impact upon the family. First the family was no longer able to be as productive and self-sufficient as it was in its prior rural settings. As described above, the family became primarily a unit of consumption. Many of the needs of family members were satisfied by agencies outside the home. In addition many remaining household duties were substantially simplified as a result of the mechanization derived from an advancing technology (a part of industrialization). This meant less time and energy was needed to provide for the family's survival, and more time was available to family members for devotion to other activities. Consequently more emphasis was placed upon individual needs and interests. This often resulted in challenges to traditional family authority and relationships.

Because the urban setting provided various opportunities for individuals to pursue and satisfy their needs outside the family, family members were involved in various groups and situations that involved interaction with many strangers--individuals unknown to other family members. Whether it was working, educational, or other types of experiences, these non-family members were frequently individuals with different beliefs and backgrounds. Many individuals were constantly confronted by new and different beliefs and behavior in their relationships outside the family.

Hence the heterogeneity of the urban population tended to challenge one's belief in the exclusiveness of their particular family patterns. Their family patterns were obviously just one of many possibilities. Added to this was the fact that religious and community control, which tended to support family control, was no longer as strong as in the rural past. In part this was due to the increasing amount of anonymity that was possible as the urban areas became larger and more dense. Thus, it is argued, urban areas provided an environment which contained several elements conducive to the weakening of family patterns that had been a part of the rural setting. (cf. Burgess and Locke 1953:120-121; Nimkoff, 1947:143-145; Wirth, 1938). For structural aspects, this meant that the extended family was no longer necessary or desired; the number of children per family was also lowered. The necessity of both these aspects was assumed to disappear in the urban setting.

These are the different industrialization and urbanization aspects which have been presented and are presumed to have reshaped the family. Of the two processes industrialization is usually emphasized more than urbanization. Although many writers take for granted that these two processes developed concomitantly, industrialization is frequently considered the independent variable when focusing only on these two processes. Regarding the power to reshape the family, industrialization is generally deemed more potent (cf. Woznick, 1972;2). In some cases only industrialization is taken into account as the key independent variable in changing the family (cf. Goode, 1963:366-380; Nimhoff, 1965:61-62: Martinson, 1970:75-76). The fact that the presentation of industrialization aspects is more detailed and contains more aspects than for urbanization reflects the emphasis upon the former.

Procedure

The discussion of these aspects suggests that industrialization had more to do with structural changes in the family while urbanization tends to be related more to the changing functions of the family. In addition the industrialization aspects are primarily manifestations of this process in the economic institution. More specifically most of these aspects concern changes regarding occupational roles. Hence focusing upon the occupational roles of the family heads as an important link between the family and industrialization, as manifest in the economy, should lead to a better understanding of family change. Also this should be useful in assessing the importance of occupational roles in this relationship.

Thus the process of industrialization which has brought about dramatic changes in the economy in turn brings about changes in the family to maintain a balanced interchange with the economy. The contention is that the family unit as a result has become nuclear in structure, smaller in size, more mobile, and less kin oriented.

A practical advantage to using the family head's occupational role is that historical data can be gathered on this variable as well as data on the structure of the head's family unit. For the nineteenth century the information is available from original census manuscripts schedules but regrettably only for the 1850 through to the 1880 censuses. Prior to 1850 the prime concern of the censuses was simply the enumeration of the population, most of the 1890 original manuscript schedules were destroyed by fire, and starting with the 1900 census the manuscript schedules are classified as "confidential" by law. Fortunately this period from 1850 to 1880 covers a time for the United States considered the beginning, rapid acceleration, and spread of the processes of industrialization and urbanization (Schneider, 1957:51-71; Wilensky and Lebeaux. 1958:49).

Using the original manuscript census schedules a national sample of 9,600 households was selected for the 1850 to 1880 period. A stratified cluster sampling procedure was used with data being collected for one hundred household units from twenty-four counties from throughout the United States as of January, 1850. Two counties were selected from three, four state clusters that had been selected from three state strata--Northeast, Midwest (North Central), and South. The information available on the manuscript schedules made it possible to determine the membership of sample family units and measure various structural aspects for the family of residence -- any group of two or more individuals who are related by blood, marriage or adoption and share the same dwelling unit. (For more information on sample collection and the re-counting procedure see Seward, 1974:82-96, 273-287.) As the occupation for family head was also recorded this characteristic can be related to the various family characteristics.

Findings

The relationship between industrialization and the family was tested by comparing the non-family work roles performed by the primary breadwinners for the nineteenth century sample of families to the structural characteristics for the families of these same individuals. The family heads' occupations were categorized into the following groups: 1. Professional and technical; 2. Business managers, officials, and proprietors; 3. Clerical; 4. Sales; 5. Craftsmen and foremen; 6. Operatives; 7. Private household; 8. Service; 9. Laborers; and 10. Farmers. This breakdown and order of presentation was based upon the classification code system developed for the United States Bureau of the Census (Edwards, 1943; Miller, 1970:172-193).

The occupations for the nineteenth century sample of family heads were categorized in these groups, although same occupations were difficult to define and others difficult to categorize (cf.. Seward, 1974:303-311). The occupational data were handled in this way to make possible comparisons with contemporary data.

Table 1 presents the distributions of family heads by these occupational groups for the four sample censuses. The clear majority of sample family heads were involved in farming (either owners, managers, or laborers). In addition the percent of farmers declines throughout the sample period from 58.6 to 52.9 percent indicating a shift in the occupational structure toward non-agricultural positions. Although in the expected direction the decline is not as great as what occurred for the total labor force -- 63.7 to 49.4 percent -- from 1850 to 1880 (United States: Bureau of the Census, 1960:72). The occupational groups which clearly increased during the period were non-farm laborers, service workers, clerical workers, and private household workers. The remaining groups either fluctuated or decreased in incidence although the overall change was not very substantial. Some of the decline recorded for these groups results from the increase (the largest of any group) in private household workers. This change primarily results from varying methods used by the census bureau to enumerate occupations for females. In 1850 and 1860 occupations were only recorded for male family members over the ago of 15 years. For 1870 and 1880 the occupations of all family members regardless of sex were solicited. Since the private household workers' group was dominated by females, a significant number was only reported for 1870 and 1880 (in the South a large percent of these were former slaves who had been enumerated separately in 1850 and 1860). (Also note decline in last row of Table 1 due to increase in females having occupation recorded.)

Hence the decline exhibited by several groups in part results from the large increase in private household workers. Despite this situation the data for the sample's occupational groups display a pattern close to the expected one for a nation experiencing the beginning and development of industrialization.

Table 1 about here.

Table 2 presents the distribution of family heads for the same occupational groups from the 1950 to 1970 national censuses. The percent of farmers has clearly gone through the most change since the 1850 to 1880 period. By 1950 only 14.1 percent of family heads were involved in farming and this decreased to only 4.1 percent by 1970. In general most of the other occupational groups had increased substantially before the contemporary period as would be expected to result from industrialization. In addition the decline in laborers and increase in professional and technical jobs both from the nineteenth century data and throughout the contemporary period indicated the trend toward a service oriented economy.

Table 2 about here.

This grouping of occupations has often been used as a scale with the amount of income, prestige, and skill and training required generally expected to decline as one goes from the top group to the bottom one (Miller, 1970:169-199; Bonjean, Hill, and McLemore, 1967:388-389;423-429). It also can be seen as representing roughly a rank order of increasing substitutability with those at the bottom have the highest value being the most interchangeble on this criterion. It is expected that family structural aspects will vary to some degree with different levels of substitutability.

The family structural characteristics observed were the following: size, type, extension, marital pairs, subfamilies, children, marital status of head, sex of head, and head's geographical mobility. It has been suggested that a linear (at least montonic) association exist between these occupational groups and family structure. Those occupations at the top of the scale should be associated with smaller families who have fewer children, less of a tendency to be extended (lack of subfamilies or multiple marital pairs), more frequently headed by a single (unmarried, divorced, or separated) person, and more often have their own private household, and geographically mobile. The occupations at the lower end of the scale tend more often to be large, extended families which include more children, subfamilies, more than one marital pair, more often must share their household with another family, be headed by a married couple, and geographically stable.

This expected association suggest an important reason for the differences between pre-industrial and postindustrial families are changes in the occupational structure of society. When a society industrializes the proportion of occupations in the upper groups increases while those in the lower groups decrease, especially farmers. The result is changes in family structure primarily due to the new demands or characteristics of higher level occupations which are being performed by an increasingly larger proportion of the society's primary breadwinners from its family units.

Table 3 presents the incidence levels for the various family aspects observed by each occupational group of family heads as well as the incidence level for the total sample. Each family aspect is ranked according to the expected level of incidence as determined from the presumed effect of industrialization. Those groups with the lowest numbers (ranks) are exhibiting the incidence levels expected to be associated with industrialization.

Table 3 about here

The levels of incidence, rankings, and Spearman's Rhos based upon the ranks all indicated some differences in family structure for the occupational groups; however, the pattern is a very mixed one. As a result it is difficult to generalize from the data but some observations are warranted.

Farmers did tend to exhibit several of the patterns (higher level of incidence) expected for pre-industrial families. Families headed by farmers as expected had the largest family size. This was related to the fact that these same families tended to be more often headed by a married couple, extended, contain a subfamily, and have more marital pairs and children than most other occupational groups. The only pattern that clearly violated the expectation was having the highest incidence of primary families--the family in a household that contains the household head. Farmers were the least likely to share their household with another secondary (non-related) family unit. When these families did share their household it tended to be with a subfamily (a nuclear family related to the household head). Also during this time housing was more abundant in rural areas. Regarding the two remaining aspects (female family heads and geographical mobility) the families of farmers were close to the median incidence--no trend.

Unexpectedly an opposite pattern was not true for the top occupational group-professional and technical jobs. In fact the pattern for this group was very much the same as for the farmers. The families with heads holding professional and technical jobs also tended to have larger families which was again due to more marital pairs, subfamilies, and children than for most other groups.

An exception from the pattern for farmers was a much lower rank for the incidence of extended family, which is the only aspect of the five mentioned so far for this top group that is in line with the expected effects of industrialization. Two other aspects also in line with the expectation were percent of primary families, and high geographical mobility. But for the first of these patterns as well as for the only remaining two--single and female family heads--the incidence levels are very similar (not the opposite as expected) to those recorded for farmer families. In addition with the exception of only two aspects (subfamilies and geographical mobility) the same discussion applies for the families of managers, officials, and proprietors. Hence there is almost no support for a monotonic much less a linear pattern. The lack of significant Spearman's Rho's (only female family heads had one) also suggest this.

Surprisingly the two groups which exhibit more of the expected levels of incidence than any other are the families of private household and service workers. These families had the smallest sizes recorded which ties in with the lowest incidence for marital pairs, and the highest incidence for single family heads who tend more often to be female. For the number of children, however, the pattern was split with the lowest number occurring for service workers and one of the highest for private household workers. The remaining patterns (primary family, extended family, subfamilies, and geographical mobility) are the only ones which go in the direction of traditional expectations.

Based upon the discussion of these four non-farming occupational groups it appears that if the last category of farmers is eliminated from the comparisons the various rankings of incidence levels follows a more monotonic pattern.

Observing only the first nine categories the family aspects which more clearly exhibit a monotonic pattern are size, type (primary families), marital pairs, single family head, and female headed. This is suggested in Table 2 by both the rankings of the first nine occupational categories and the second row of Rhos based upon these categories. For each of these five aspects the correlation coefficient increased and with the exception of female headed families this increase was a substantial one. In addition where as only female headed families was statistically significant (at the .05 level for a one-tailed test) when observing all ten categories, all of these aspects except size is statistically significant when observing only the first nine categories. Although these five family aspects display covariation only the change in family type goes in the expected direction (positive). The negative Rhos for size, marital pairs, single family head, and female headed present a pattern in reverse of expectations. Hence for four of the family aspects that exhibited variation by occupational group, the family pattern thought to be more typical of groups that dominated the occupational structure in pre-industrial societies were exhibited by families in the upper occupational groups.

For the remaining aspects (extension, subfamilies, children, and geographical mobility) no clear trend either way emerges. Note the low Rhos and the decline in the Rho values for three of four aspects when only the first nine categories were considered. Finally it should be noted that regarding several of the aspects the overall range of differences for incidence levels was very small, e. g. subfamilies families.

Summary

Thus some of the evidence suggests that as the proportion of farmers declined in the labor force some aspects of the expected transition in the family occurred. But the expected relationship between occupational level for non-farm jobs and family structure apparently followed a pattern in reverse of the expectation for the majority of aspects where differences were found. Although for several aspects large difference between occupational groups did not occur and in some cases no trend emerged.

Table I

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY HEADS BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

1850 to 1880 SAMPLE

Occupational groups	1850	1860	1870	1880
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	4.0	4.2	3.1	3.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors	4.8	4.1	3.4	3.5
Clerical and kindred workers	1.6	1.9	2.2	2.9
Sales Workers	1.0	0.5	0.9	1.0
Craftmen, foremen, and kindred workers	11.3	11.9	8.9	7.7
Operatives and kindred workers	7.7	8.3	8.9	6.7
Private Household workers	0.0	1.4	7.8	7.5
Service workers	0.3	0.9	0.9	1.3
Laborers	10.6	9.9	10.1	13.2
Farmers	58.6	56.8	53.8	52.9
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	2337	2368	2583	2420
Number of Unclassified occupations or family head with none listed	347	298	129	76

Source: United States: Bureau of the Census, Seventh Census Population Schedules, Eighth Census Population Schedules, Ninth Census Population Schedules, and Tenth Census Population Schedules, Microfilm Publication Numbers M704, M653, M593, and T9. Washington,D.C. National Archives and Records Service.

Table 2

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY HEADS BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS: 1950 to 1970

Occupational groups	1950	1960	1970
Professional, technical and kindred workers	8.0	11.2	14.8
Managers, officials, and proprietors	12.2	12.4	12.3
Clerical and kindred workers	12.6[a]	14.6[a]	8.6
Sales workers			6.9
Craftmen, foremen, and kindred workers	19.7	21.2	21.6
Operatives and kindred workers	20.0	20.5	18.9
Private Household workers	6.4[a]	6.8[a]	0.5
Service workers			7.6
Laborers	6.7	5.6	4.7
Farmers	14.1	7.6	4.1
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	30,795,030	34,887,689	40,144,761

Source: United States: Bureau of the Census (1963: 1-475, 1-475: 1973: 138).

[a]For these figures the Census Bureau did not report separated statistics for the two listed occupational groups.

Table 3

FAMILY STRUCTURAL ASPECTS BY INCIDENCE AND RANK FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS: 1850 to 1880 SAMPLE

Occupational groups	Family Aspects								
	Family Size	Percent Primary Families	Percent Extended Families	Number of marital Pairs	Percent of Families with Sub-families	Number of Children	Percent of Single Family Heads	Percent of Female Family Heads	Family Heads Geographically Mobile
Professional, technical and kindred workers	4.47 (8)	89.3 (3)	3.1 (3)	93.8 (8)	2.5 (7)	2.34 (6)	7.9 (8)	1.7 (7)	75.1 (1)
Managers, officials, and proprietors	4.5 (9)	89.5 (2)	3.4 (5)	92.9 (6)	1.6 (1)	2.49 (9)	7.6 (9)	1.6 (8)	66/9 (7)
Clerical and kindred workers	3.97 (3)	75.6 (8)	3.8 (6)	95.7 (10)	1.9 (2)	1.81 (2)	9.1 (5)	0.5 (10)	61.1 (9)
Sales workers	4.21 (4)	85.7 (4)	4.8 (8)	89.3 (3)	3.6 (9)	1.98 (3)	13.1 (3)	3.6 (3)	69.0 (4)
Craftmen, foremen and kindred workers	4.45 (7)	82.2 (5)	2.8 (2)	95.0 (9)	2.5 (6)	2.36 (7)	6.9 (10)	0.6 (9)	71.1 (3)
Operatives, and kindred workers	4.22 (5)	77.6 (6)	3.4 (4)	92.6 (5)	2.0 (3)	2.15 (4)	8.9 (6)	1.8 (6)	61.1 (8)
Private household workers	3.80 (2)	77.2 (7)	7.2 (10)	9.4 (1)	4.3 (10)	2.41 (8)	95.2 (1)	94.0 (1)	68.4 (6)
Service workers	3.52 (1)	61.4 (10)	6.0 (9)	68.7 (2)	2.4 (5)	1.65 (1)	33.7 (2)	28.9 (2)	59.0 (10)

Table 3 (continued)

Laborers	4.32 (6)	73.5 (9)	2.5 (1)	91.5 (4)	2.3 (4)	2.19 (5)	9.8 (4)	2.0 (5)	73.5 (2)
Farmers	5.15 (10)	97.3 (1)	4.2 (7)	93.5 (7)	2.9 (8)	3.03 (10)	8.3 (7)	2.1 (4)	68.8 (5)
Total	4.76	89.3	4.0	89.4	2.7	2.68	12.3	6.0	68.8
N	9708	8668	385	8681	261	29,989	1,197	587	3013
r_s[a]	-.13	.31	.19	-.44	.27	.09	-.42	-.59*	.10
r_s[b]	-.55	.80*	.07	-.63*	.15	-.25	-.58*	-.62*	.17

a. Based upon ranking of variables.
b. Based upon ranks of first nine categories excluding farmers.
* Correlation coefficient is significant at .05 level for one-tailed test.

Source: United States: Bureau of the Census, Seventh Census Population Schedules, Eighth Census Population Schedules, Ninth Census Population Schedules, and Tenth Census Population Schedules, Microfilm Publication Numbers M704, M653, M593, and T9. Washington, D.C. National Archives and Records Service

REFERENCES

Aldous, Joan
1969 "Occupational Characteristics and Male's Role Performance in the Family." Journal of Marriage and Family 31 (November):707-712.

Bell, Norman W. and Ezra Vogel
1968 A Modern Introduction to the Family. Revised Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Bonjean, Charles, Richard J. Hill, and S. Dale McLemore
1967 Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices. San Francisco: Chandler

Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke
1953 The Family: From Institution to Companionship. Second Edition, New York: American Book Company

Edwards, Alba M.
1943 Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940 Population. Comparative Occupations Statistics for the United States 1870 to 1940. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Goode, William J.
1963 World Revolution and Family Patterns. New York: The Free Press.

Greenfield, Sidney M.
1967 "Industrialization and the Family in Sociological Theory." American Journal of Sociology 67 (November):312-322.

Harris, C. C.
1969 Family: An Introduction. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lantz, Herman and Eloise Snyder
1969 Marriage: An Examination of the Man-Woman Relationship. Second Edition New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Martinson, Floyd M.
1970 Family in Society. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

Miller, Delbert C.
1970 Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. Second Edition. New York: David McKay.

Nimkoff, Meyer F.
1947 Marriage and Family. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
1965 Comparative Family Systems. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert Bales
1955 Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Schneider, Eugene V.
1957 Industrial Society. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Seward, Rudy Ray
1974 "The American Family: A Study of Structural Trends from the Colonial Period to the Present." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Southern Illinois University.

Stuckert, Robert P.
1963 "Occupational Mobility and Family Relationships." Social Forces 41(March):301-307.

United States: Bureau of the Census
1960 Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
1963 United States Census of Population: 1960. Volume 1, Detailed Characteristics, U.S. Summary. Final Report. PC (1) - D. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
1973 Census of Population: 1970. Subject Reports. Final Report. PC (2) - 4A, Family Composition. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Wilensky, Harold and Charles Lebeaux
1958 Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wirth, Louis
1938 "Urbanism as a Way of Life." American Journal of Sociology 44 (July): 1-24.

Wozniak, Paul R.
1972 "Family Systems, Industrialization and Demographic Factors: An Appraisal of the Arguments and Evidence." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August, 1972.

MICROFILM

United States: Bureau of the Census
1971 Seventh Census Population Schedules. Microfilm Publication Number 432. Rolls 30, 31, 67, 75, 182, 184,230, 233, 264-267, 332-339, 350, 354, 393, 404, 505, 517-522, 749, 835, 909, and 916.
Eighth Census Population Schedules. Microfilm Publication Number M653. Rolls 50, 52, 119, 129, 311, 322, 409, 413, 445-447, 443, 518-526, 544, 549, 610, 629, 754, 763-776, 1069,1070, 1193, 1194, 1289, and 1307.
Ninth Census Population Schedules. Microfilm Publication Number M593. Rolls 63, 66, 146, 160, 376, 391, 508, 517, 552-556, 638-650, 671, 684, 763, 787, 937, 946-963, 1300-1301, 1464, 1578, and 1607.
Tenth Census Population Schedules. Microfilm Publication Number T9. Rolls 56, 58-59, 143, 154, 326-327, 339-340, 449, 456-457, 485-487, 549-562, 579, 589, 676-677, 699, 833-834, 840-857, 1095-1096, 1202-1203, 1294, and 1330.
Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service.